



Jim Christiansen
01/23/2002 11:36 AM

To: ross@parkcity2002.com, lammers@parkcity2002.com
cc: mslam@deq.state.ut.us, Catherine Roberts/OCP/R8/USEPA/US, mstraube@inquo.net,
mhughes@resolv.org

Subject: Soils work group start

Toby/Paul -

EPA and UDEQ received your recommendations on moving forward with soils work group. We are very anxious to get started, so let's go for the 31st. We had just a few concerns:

1. Size of core group. I'm sure you realize it, but it may be difficult to schedule everyone who is listed for regular meetings. We are concerned that this may bog down the effort when we have already spent considerable time talking generalities. Most of the people on the core group list are also general stakeholders (and have many other commitments) and this may double up their time - can they spare another full or half day? Similarly, I am not sure if it is important, at this stage, to include Utah State Parks, United Park City Mines, or CARG. EPA specifically doesn't have any specific concerns with past rail trail work. And, we always have the general stakeholder group to interact with the full spectrum. Bottom line, please make every effort to make sure the process is manageable and that the core group is made up of the essentials and people willing/able to make commitments to work on the issue. Since there is a great deal of overlap with stakeholders, perhaps we can get started toward the end of our Jan 30 meeting and then follow up on Jan 31 or a later date with more specifics.
2. Representation of PPHA. At present, Sally (and to an extent Dana) are the only representatives of the Prospector homeowners. Both Sally and Dana have been active, interested stakeholders and we greatly appreciate that. However, Sally's views on this effort are very clear and generally very unilateral. Dana is also a veteran of Prospector past and a realtor. Those facts are not bad, but we feel we need to *at least* balance those views with others that are less "decided." At the last stakeholder meeting, Sally mentioned she would check with the homeowners association to see if someone was interested. This is a very important point for us. I have found that Cliff Allen (the current? President of the HOA) was pretty well-rounded on the issue and was not involved in the 80s. He may be able to participate or help us find someone similar who will.
3. We still have some concerns on trying to do too much before we have really given the public at large the means to influence the process. No real comment or suggestion here, just realize that we will be sensitive to this during discussions on purpose, scope, and timing. I think this will be ongoing discussion between us, but I also don't think we are too far apart. I hope that if we make good progress on those points and then public discussion indicates we are really off-base that we can revisit them. Again, I don't think our approaches vary too much on this but we can only tell once we start talking specifics.
4. We will work on providing answers to your remaining questions, which are good technical issues. Keep in mind that there will still be some things we can't answer definitively or can only provide a set of options for.

Let's get going! If we can't make the 31st work, I don't want to wait two months until the next stakeholder meeting, but instead would push for a special meeting ASAP. Thanks. Jim